DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 141 FL 006 768

AUTHOR Verdoodt, Albert
TITLE Linguistic Problems of Adult Migrant Workers and Socio-linguistic Problems of Migrant Workers' Children Being Educated in the Host Country.
INSTITUTION Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France). Committee for Higher Education and Research.
PUB DATE 30 Jan 73
NOTE 33p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS..PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Cultural Factors; Culture Contact; Diglossia; *Educational Policy; *Migrant Adult Education; *Migrant Child Education; Minority Groups; National Programs; Political Influences; Social Factors; *Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

This article examines the linguistic problems of adult migrant workers and sociolinguistic problems of their children. The introduction states provisions for migrant workers' ethnic and linguistic rights. An examination of the actual situation leads to the general statement that linguistic rights of migrant workers are passively tolerated and not actively encouraged by the host country. The reasons for this situation are examined, as well as obstacles which stand in the way of successful implementation of government-subsidized bilingual programs in the United States. Various bilingual program models in the United States and in Europe are discussed. The conclusion argues for a pluralistic bilingual education program for migrant groups, supported by the host country. Sample questionnaires are included in appendixes. (AM)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg 30 January 1973 CCC/ESR (73) 6
Or. Fr.

ED104141

COMMITTEE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Linguistic problems of adult migrant workers and socio-linguistic problems of migrant workers' children being educated in the host country

by Albert VERDOODT

Department of Sociology, Catholic University of Louvain

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

29.082
04.1

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The situation	3
III.	Reasons for the situation	7
IV.	Obstacles in the way of a satisfactory solution	13
V.	Conclusions	20
Appendix I	Questionnaire sent to Council of Europe correspondents	22
Appendix II	Questionnaire on bilingual programmes in the Limburg area (Belgium)	24
Appendix III	Bibliography	29

Introduction

For the purposes of this study, the term "migrant worker" is used in the sense of the revised preliminary draft European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers, namely a national of a Contracting Party who has been authorised by another Contracting Party to reside on its territory with a view to taking up paid employment. Under the same revised draft, the term does not cover:

(a) frontier workers;

(b) artists engaged for a short period and members of a liberal profession;

(c) seamen;

(d) persons undergoing training.

The draft is completely silent on the right to preserve the language of one's country of origin and transmit it to one's children. Nor is this right mentioned in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The only international legal instruments that might be invoked by migrant groups are:

1. Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which stipulates that: "In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess their own religion, or to use their own language."

2. Article 5 of the UNESCO Convention against discrimination in education, which, in paragraph 1 (c) provides as follows: "The States Parties to this Convention agree that it is essential to recognise the right of members of national minorities to carry on their own educational activities including the maintenance of schools and, depending on the educational policy of each State, the use or the teaching of their own language, provided however: -

(i) that this right is not exercised in a manner which prevents the members of these minorities from understanding the culture and language of the community as a whole and from participating in its activities, or which prejudices national sovereignty;

(ii) that the standard of education is not lower than the general standard laid down or approved by the competent authorities; and

(iii) that attendance at such schools is optional."

We shall now take a look at how matters stand in practice, seek out the underlying reasons in socio-linguistic terms, investigate the obstacles in the way of a satisfactory solution, and finally draw certain conclusions.

II. The situation

In order to find out about the teaching of the languages of migrants' countries of origin, an enquiry had of course to be carried out in member States of the Council of Europe. A questionnaire was carefully worked out on the basis of a number of tests, and sent out to the "modern-language correspondents" of the Council of Europe's Committee for General and Technical Education by Mr. S. NORD, deputy Head of the Council of Europe's Division for General and Technical Education. (For the texts of the questionnaire and covering letter, see Appendix I.)

Replies were received from 8 countries:

1. Austria: Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst;
2. Belgium: Mr. M. LEMAIRE, Inspecteur de l'enseignement moyen et normal;
3. Denmark: Mr. P. HOLST-JENSEN, lektor;
4. Finland: National Board of Schools;
5. France: Ministère de l'Education Nationale;
6. Italy: Mr. V. GIGLIO;
7. Norway: National Council for Innovation in Education;
8. Federal Republic of Germany: Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

The questionnaire yielded the following findings:

(a) Almost all migrants come from Mediterranean countries

There are, however, exceptions, viz:

1. Denmark, where groups of immigrants from Germany and Great Britain (numbers unspecified) are mentioned;

2. Finland, where there are immigrants from Germany (800), Great Britain (700), the Soviet Union (450), Poland (300), Hungary (125) and the Netherlands (120);

3. Norway - immigrants from Denmark (5,032), Finland (960), Sweden (1,731), Pakistan (989), the Netherlands (360), Great Britain (2,079) and Germany (1,222).

These three countries do have immigrants from Mediterranean countries too, however, but the numbers are not specified except in the case of Finland (which mentions 150 Italians) and Norway (453 Moroccans, 769 Yugoslavs and 2,767 other Europeans - probably from the Mediterranean area judging by the terms of the reply).

(b) All countries answered "yes" to the question about the teaching of the language of the host country

This question was placed at this point in order to facilitate the answer to the following question.

(c) Replies to the question on the teaching of the language of the country of origin were far more hesitant, especially if considered in conjunction with the replies to the subsequent questions

("Are there any primary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin? Are there any secondary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin?"). Briefly, where may migrant workers' children receive instruction in the language of the country of origin thanks to:

1. the government of the host country? Nowhere, except perhaps in the Federal Republic of Germany, where the Länder might provide such instruction at their own expense or else exempt migrants' children in secondary schools from attending lessons in the compulsory foreign language and replace them with lessons in their mother tongue. Since these arrangements stem from a Conference of Ministers of Culture (also responsible for supervising education) held on 2 December 1971, it is too early to tell whether they have started to be implemented.

2. the government of the country of origin? In Belgium (in the case of Italians, Spaniards, Poles, Greeks and Turks), Finland (Germans, British, Russians and Poles), France (Arabs, Spaniards, Portuguese, Italians and Poles) and the Federal Republic of Germany (Italians, Greeks, Turks, Spaniards, Yugoslavs and Portuguese).

3. private bodies subsidised by the government of the host country? In Finland (Russians and Poles) and Austria (Yugoslavs and Turks).

4. private organisations subsidised by the government of the country of origin? In Finland (British).

5. non-subsidised private organisations? In Belgium (Arabs, Poles (1) and Ukrainians).

(d) To the question "Are there any primary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin?"

Only Belgium replied that there were such schools, viz. two for Italians (in the Limburg area) and one for Spaniards (in Brussels).

(e) To the question "Are there any secondary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin?"

Belgium replied that there was one such school for Italians (in Limburg) and another for Spaniards (in Brussels). Finland mentioned a German, an English, a Russian and a French secondary school.

(f) There were no specific replies to the question "Is there any ministerial department responsible for the linguistic status of migrant workers and their children?"

(g) To the question "If not, can you supply the name and address of any person well informed about the linguistic status of migrants and their children?"

The following replies were received:

1. Belgium: Mme Martynov, Radio-télévision belge, Palais des Congrès, 4000 Liège.

2. France: M. Manguin, 32 rue de Penthièvre, Paris 8me.

3. Norway: Mr. L. Stølen, Sandakerveien, 56 Oslo.

An attempt might be made to sum up the situation on the basis of a distinction drawn by Heinz KLOOS (2), viz. a distinction between linguistic rights that are actively encouraged and those which are passively tolerated. The former may be sub-divided according to how actively they are encouraged but they, in all cases, presuppose that the host country's authorities at national, provincial or municipal level, give official recognition to the migrants' language

./.

(1) i.e. Poles who do not wish their children to attend lessons subsidised by Poland.

(2) "Das Nationalitätenrecht der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika", Vienna, Braumüller, 1963, pp. 21-26.

in some practical way, such as by publishing notices in the language, having it taught in State or State-subsidised schools or purchasing books in the language for public libraries. Passively tolerated linguistic rights, on the other hand, merely permit the migrants' language to be used in fields where the host country's government is not primarily responsible - the publication of newspapers, for instance, or the running of private evening classes, schools and libraries.

Summing up, then, it may be said that the linguistic rights of migrant workers are generally passively tolerated but not actively encouraged by the host country. In some cases the country of origin supports the implementation of these passively tolerated rights.

III. Reasons for the situation

Why do migrant workers not generally enjoy actively encouraged rights as far as their mother tongue is concerned?

I shall try to answer the question by treating migrant workers as part of a broader phenomenon, viz. part of a minority enjoying little or no protection.

To simplify the comparison somewhat, I shall treat the members of minorities and majorities as belonging to two single groups. In fact, however, the dominant element may consist of a coalition of groups (e.g. the German-speaking, French speaking and Italian-speaking groups in Switzerland), while the dominated element need not be homogeneous either, (e.g. the various groups of migrant workers in Switzerland).

My initial theoretical approach will be based on the work of the sociologist R. Schermerhorn (1).

According to this writer, before a study is made of relations between two groups in contact with each other, attention must be given to the stage prior to contact, regard being had to the different systems of values as well as to the linguistic gap between each group's mode of speech. The difficulties and stress experienced by a newcomer will obviously be directly proportionate in magnitude to the gap between the two systems. The contact stage itself may be seen in terms of an independent variable, an intermediate variable and a dependent variable.

The independent variable consists essentially in the pattern of the power relationship between the two groups. Observation reveals, however, that migrant workers generally have little power in political terms.

In the interaction resulting from contact, when the majority group comes to establish its ascendancy over the other, this power relationship is perceived by the two groups in terms of legitimacy and illegitimacy. These perceptions then crystallise in a series of attitudes, conceptions and arguments. It is on these arguments, which form the backbone of the intermediate variable, that I shall now dwell, using the ideas of H. Kloss as a basis (2).

./.

---

(1) See, in particular, "Toward a General Theory of Minority Groups", Phylon, XXV, 1964, No. 3, pp. 238-246.

(2) "Language Rights and Immigrant Groups", International Migration Review, V, 1971, No. 2, pp. 250-268.

Kloss reduces the number of arguments most commonly put forward for withholding actively encouraged linguistic rights to four, viz. the tacit agreement argument, the give-and-take argument, the national unity argument and the anti-ghetto argument. In my efforts to refute these arguments, I shall follow Kloss's train of thought fairly closely.

1. The tacit agreement argument

We often hear the argument that, by applying for admission to another country, migrants conclude a tacit agreement to the effect that, in return for permission to live in that country, they are prepared to adapt to their new surroundings, both culturally and linguistically.

This argument does not fit the facts, however. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, countries like Argentina, Brazil, Canada and the United States gave newcomers considerable opportunity to found schools using their own language, or bilingual schools. It was only later (in 1916 or thereabouts) that certain restrictions were imposed. There were even cases of minorities fleeing from Europe for the very purpose of escaping from linguistic persecution in the avowed hope that outside their native country their language would have a better chance of survival. Indeed, there have been times when some minority languages were more vigorous and better cared for outside their original boundaries than inside. This was the case with Albanian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Yiddish and the Syrian variety of Arabic. Nowadays, Ukrainians in Western Europe claim that the language they teach their children is purer than the one used in schools in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In the case of migrant workers, the absence of any tacit agreement is even more likely. Many wish to return sooner or later to their own countries, together with their children, and therefore intend to keep up their own traditions, especially their language.

2. The give-and-take argument runs as follows: immigrants are generally better off than in their own countries, and in return they ought to adapt wholeheartedly and unreservedly to the host country.

An enquiry would be needed for it to be possible to refute this argument in detail. There are indeed cases of migrant workers greatly improving their financial circumstances without making any very original contribution to the economic life of the host country. But even then they help to increase the consumer market, and above all they provide extra manpower, which is vital in an expanding economy. Moreover, their contribution generally changes in the course of time, and their children sometimes take up intellectual occupations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

But whatever kind of contribution they may make, migrant workers are not generally aware of being expected to give up their language and traditions in exchange for a job in the host country. They are often attracted, or even directed towards places where fellow-countrymen of theirs are living. They may therefore legitimately hope to preserve and pass on their cultural heritage.

3. The national unity argument may be summed up as follows: it is important not to give any encouragement to migrant workers trying to preserve and pass on their own language, because their efforts may rapidly give rise to a separatist political movement.

This argument seems purely hypothetical. The Lebanese expert, Charles Ammoun (1), has clearly shown that, on the contrary, "in countries in which several languages are traditionally written and spoken by the inhabitants, it is possible to integrate the various groups into the national community while safeguarding their cultural heritage". And, indeed, this does seem to be the case with migrants and immigrants in the Lebanon. Although the Palestinian refugees are a problem at the moment, they are an exceptional case. As a rule, migrant workers are not very numerous, and in very few places do they outnumber the host country's nationals. Consequently, secession is not even a theoretical possibility. Moreover, modern industrial society tends to break down all the barriers behind which a group of migrants might otherwise isolate themselves. Migrant communities often, on the contrary, show an irresistible tendency to become linguistically assimilated with their new neighbours. Spanish-speaking workers who take jobs in Catalonia, for instance, frequently adopt the Catalan language (2). And all emigration countries which try to give cultural assistance to their nationals abroad agree that they are often fighting a losing battle.

4. The anti-ghetto argument is that, in the case of migrants, passing the mother tongue on from one generation to another has the effect of enclosing children inside a barren ghetto, where they are cut off both from the life of the host country and from the cultural development of the country of origin, with which they cannot hope to keep up real links. Even at the occupational level, it is argued, this transmission of the mother tongue makes it difficult for them to master the host country's language, at least as regards their accent, which never loses its foreignness.

./.

---

(1) "Study of Discrimination in Education", New York, United Nations, 1957, p. 114.

(2) J. SOETENS, "L'assimilation des immigrés en Catalogne", Geneva, Faculté des sciences econ. et soc. de l'Université, 1963, Thesis No. 163.

To answer this argument, it will be necessary to use a socio-linguistic approach, based on the distinction drawn by J. FISHMAN (1) between bilingualism, which is essentially a feature of an individual's linguistic behaviour and diglossia, which denotes the use of two languages by a whole community according to a set pattern. In other words, diglossia is a social consensus whereby language A is used in some spheres (e.g. private ones) and language B in others (e.g. public spheres). Diglossia and bilingualism do not necessarily go hand in hand. There are diglossic societies with few bilingual individuals (e.g. Haiti, Puerto Rico); there are also societies with many bilingual individuals but with no clear-cut consensus on the use of one language rather than the other in certain fields (e.g. the German-speaking parts of Belgium). This latter case (bilingualism without diglossia) is common among the dismembered families of recent immigrants in the United States.

If the bilingualism/diglossia distinction is applied to migrant workers in Europe, there are three possible relationships between bilingualism and diglossia which may be encountered. The most common one, especially among children, is similar to that of recent immigrants in the United States, i.e. bilingualism without diglossia. Because of the rapid social change which migration inevitably entails, the old and new languages tend to lose their separate functions. Migrants' children, moreover, become bilingual at a very early age. Pressure from official institutions has the effect of making these children increasingly unilingual, but in a language other than the one used in their homes. In the end, the language used in schools, places of work and administrative departments almost entirely supersedes the mother tongue. At the same time the linguistic repertoire loses its initial compartments, as differences between roles and the complementarity of values decrease considerably. The two languages, originally quite separate, begin to influence each other phonetically, lexically, semantically and even grammatically. Instead of two languages that are carefully kept apart and each nurtured by teachers, preachers and writers, there emerge intermediate linguistic varieties and various degrees of overlapping. As a result, scorn is poured on the mother-tongue of migrants' children because it is corrupt, but no attempt is made to support or encourage it.

./.

---

(1) "Bilingualism with and without Diglossia, Diglossia with and without Bilingualism", Journal of Social Issues, XXIII, 1967, No. 2, pp. 28-38.

The outcome of this bilingualism without diglossia is a highly unstable situation, and soon the language associated with the dominant social forces overwhelms the other.

A kind of pidgin language may also set in, if the migrant workers are very dispersed and their children have no access to any instruction in their mother tongue.

The second possible relationship is diglossia without bilingualism. This occurs when migrant workers have very limited access to the language of the host country. The reason for this does not generally lie with the host country's authorities but rather with the homogeneous districts inhabited by the migrants. The latter are too numerous and do not have enough contact with local-born people to be able to make any real progress in the new language, which is used only in fairly rare situations. Their mother tongue is not kept up either. As a result, they may become functionally illiterate in both languages.

The third possible relationship - the only sensible one, in my view - is bilingualism combined with diglossia. This can be achieved if the migrant community manages to use its old and new languages for quite separate purposes and matters, as well as obtain, ready access to instruction in both languages. In a community of this kind, children born abroad can begin to learn their mother tongue at home and at primary school, and they can improve their proficiency in their mother tongue and acquire a proper grounding in the host country's language at secondary school and in their contacts with authorities and the occupational world.

The problems that would arise should they return to their countries of origin are reduced to a minimum.

This situation is not a purely imaginary one. A notable example of it occurred in France, between 1924 and 1940, when France wanted to attract increasing numbers of Polish migrant workers. The French Government allowed the Poles either to set up bilingual elementary schools - of which there were no less than 584 in 1929 - or to have Polish lessons in French schools. The adoption of such an arrangement required considerable efforts on the part of France, for the linguistic rights she granted to the migrant workers were generally denied to the indigenous linguistic minorities (Catalans, Bretons, Basques, Flemings, etc.). Another example, albeit on a smaller scale, of opportunities being provided for instruction in the mother tongue stems from the application of the 1952 Encyclical "Exsul Familia". According to this document, migrants may choose religious services and instruction either in their mother tongue or

in the language of the host country. It has been observed that ecclesiastical workers in this field often provide the backbone of efforts to promote the teaching of migrants' mother tongues outside the religious sphere. But to get back to the somewhat questionable attitude of the French Government, which granted certain linguistic rights to migrant workers but denied them to its own citizens, this sets off a train of thought culminating in various arguments in favour of linguistic rights for migrants.

Four of these arguments are as follows:

1. Migrant workers will feel more at home in the host country and will therefore be more willing to go or return there.

2. There will be no danger of migrant groups losing, along with their language, certain specific qualities which were the reason for their being invited to the host country in the first place.

3. The presence of people with different languages and traditions will be a source of cultural enrichment for the host country.

4. It is in a country's economic interests to keep a reservoir of bilingual people to form a kind of bridge, both now and in the future, between it and the different emigration countries.

This last argument is the one that seems to have made the greatest impression on authorities and public opinion in the United States, and it was what led to the Languages Resources Project among American Ethnic Groups being launched by the US Office of Education. Two important results of this project were:

(a) The publication, in 1966, of a group report edited by Fishman (1). This is a concise but comprehensive review of the various efforts by migrants (especially Spanish-speaking) and immigrants (especially French, German and Slavonic-speaking) to keep up their languages and pass them on to their children;

(b) The adoption by Congress, in 1967, of a law providing for subsidies for bilingual education programmes.

It would be pleasant to end on this optimistic note which, in a way, serves as an example for Europe; but attention must be drawn to a number of problems arising from the implementation of this law. The lessons that Europe can draw from this may enable it to avoid adopting a solution which not only would be costly but would ultimately fail to deal properly with the problem.

./.

(1) "Language Loyalty in the United States", The Hague, Mouton, 1966, 475 pages. There is also a fuller, roneod version (in three volumes) at the US Office of Education.

V. Obstacles in the way of a satisfactory solution

We shall now investigate the bilingual programmes subsidised by the United States Government, using the theoretical models of R. Kjolseth (1) as a basis. The latter has reduced the efforts being made in the United States to two extreme types or models. On the one hand, there is the assimilatory model, where the minority language is rapidly abandoned in spite of the fact that it is taught. On the other hand, there is the pluralistic model, whose effect is clearly positive as far as the preservation and development of migrants' or immigrants' languages are concerned.

These are, it should be noted, theoretical models representing the two ends of a continuous line of various bilingual programme arrangements.

The bilingual programmes relating to the pluralistic model were launched by a group of community leaders comprising both nationals and migrants. These community leaders have secured the co-operation of several teachers and school principals, with whom they form a standing consultative committee on the bilingual programme.

A programme of this kind is a project involving the whole community of migrants and nationals. Those administering it take care not to lose touch with the community, so as to ensure that information is regularly exchanged between the schools concerned and the local population. The community is thus closely associated with decisions concerning the programme, and public opinion is taken seriously at every stage.

The teachers engaged in the bilingual programme belong by birth to the migrants' linguistic community. They have received, and continue to receive, specialised training covering the language and culture of their country of origin, ethnolinguistics and methods of teaching the mother tongue and the second language. They live and operate in the migrant community, mainly through the bilingual programme consultative committee. Their behaviour and outlook are inbred with stable bilingualism and biculturalism. For their pupils, then, they serve as living examples of bilingualism and biculturalism.

./.

---

(1) These were expounded at the VIIth World Congress of Sociology under the title: "Bilingual Education Programmes in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism". A German translation was published in the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 1971, Sonderheft 15, pp. 251-275.

Classes under the bilingual programme are attended not only by children of migrants but also of nationals, as some of the local-born population send their children to bilingual classes as a result of a free and calculated choice. The two groups may, however, be kept separate in the first few years of primary school, not being combined until the third or fourth year.

At the initial stage of schooling the dialect or main dialects of the migrants and local population may be used, and it is the same teacher who uses the various dialects. Each idiom is given the same number of hours and the same treatment. To begin with, teaching will mainly involve repeating in one idiom what has already been taught in the other. Later, the teaching languages will be used alternately, but only one language will ever be used in any teaching period. Both languages may be used, however, in the playground and for physical education. With some programmes one of the languages may be used for certain subjects and the other language for the others, but unilingual teaching will never be confined to less important subjects.

If the dialects of the migrants and the local population were used at the outset, the two standard languages corresponding to those dialects will be gradually introduced. But the dialects will never be banished from the classroom altogether.

Particular care is taken not to disturb the balance between the teaching of the local language and that of the migrants' language. The whole programme, covering at least nine years, can thus be seen to be designed to keep up the use of both languages and, in some cases, the corresponding dialects.

Throughout this process, investigations are conducted into the attitudes of the local population towards the various idioms and those who use them. A study is also made of employment opportunities for bilinguals in education, industry, commerce and government service. The findings are passed on to the children, at first indirectly, later directly. A number of classes are held to which the parents of both language groups (nationals and migrants) are cordially invited. These classes have two aims: to explain the bilingual programme and its methods to parents and to encourage adults to take an interest in a bilingual education programme of their own. The adults' programme mainly follows the same lines as the children's, but the teaching material is different. There are thus mixed classes (migrants and nationals together), two teaching languages, the same number of hours and the same treatment for each language, consideration for dialects and preferably the same teacher and curriculum as

for the children, as well as information on job openings for bilinguals and the attitudes of the local population towards the languages involved. Parents and children of both language groups are regularly invited to cultural activities outside school hours, such as efforts to establish and run a bilingual library with comics, magazines, newspapers and books suitable for all age groups and, if necessary, all social classes.

By means of lectures and articles in local newspapers, the population is kept informed about bilingual programmes available for children and adults, the reasons for them, how they are run and what results they have achieved. For all these activities at school, in the vicinity of the school and further away, the consultative committee on the bilingual programme (or programmes) is the mainstay.

Programme assessment research is not confined to investigating changes in the linguistic abilities of individuals and the attitudes of the language groups involved; it also seeks to establish in what areas or fields of everyday life, outside school, one language is used rather than another. The nature and extent of this language use are accurately measured. In short, emphasis is placed on language sociology and not just on psycholinguistics or plain linguistics. Before we go on to the assimilatory model, I should like to mention one example of a bilingual programme that fairly well reflects the pluralistic approach, viz. the schools for Cuban migrants and immigrants in Miami (1).

Now for the main features of the assimilatory approach. Here the bilingual programme is the result of action by education authorities who have little wish to set up a consultative committee drawn from the local population. The typical teacher in such a programme will not be of the same ethnic origin as the migrants, nor will he be active in their community. He will live in a residential area far away from the migrants' districts. He will have been recruited from an ordinary class in the same school and, of course, given special training in the migrants' language and culture. But this training will not have included any thorough familiarisation with the problems arising from the use of dialects among the local-born population or the migrants. The teacher will thus have studied only the standard languages corresponding to the dialects, together with the cultures concerned. He will therefore tend to be a linguistic purist, regarding dialects as improper and incorrect.

./.

(1) See: A. Gaarder, "Organisation of the Bilingual School", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1967, pp. 110-120.

Bilingual classes are homogeneous in that they are attended only by migrants' children. It is assumed that the host country's nationals have no reason to send their children or that, even if there is an objective reason for doing so, their subjective motivation is not sufficiently strong. The programme is so designed that use of the mother tongue serves as a bridge towards use of the host country's language.

No information is provided on job opportunities for bilinguals.

Any classes to which parents are invited will be aimed at convincing the latter of the programme's excellence or attracting them to a parallel programme for adults. And if there is any such programme for adults, its purpose will be merely to eliminate illiteracy. Out-of-school cultural activities will meet with little response, as they will be remote from the migrants' own interests and bound up with the official culture of either the country of origin or the host country. Tests to measure the programme's success will be confined to individual performances at school. In short, the emphasis will be on psycholinguistics and plain linguistics. I shall not cite any actual examples of this model. An enquiry by Kjolseth at the US Office of Education, based on the annual reports of bilingual programmes, showed clearly that 80% of such programmes match the assimilatory model. I shall now leave the situation in the United States and try to assess bilingual programmes in Europe. I shall do this on the basis of Kjolseth's theoretical models, as these rest on sound socio-linguistic foundations. Clearly, there are far fewer bilingual programmes in Europe, as the replies to our questionnaire revealed (see Appendix I and the summary of replies - pages 3-6 above).

In Belgium, however, there are bilingual schools and evening courses in the languages of migrants' countries of origin. A lack of time and money compelled me to concentrate on an analysis of programmes in this country. For this purpose, I called on the services of an assistant at Louvain University, Mr. J. Van den Broeck, and a postgraduate student at the same university, Mr. J. Segers, both enrolled for a language sociology course at the Hasselt University Centre. As both come from the Province of Limburg, where 8.56% of the population are migrant workers (55,740 out of 656,525 inhabitants in 1970), it seemed highly appropriate to carry out an in-depth study in that province.

Limburg is in North-East Belgium. The official language in government departments, educational establishments, etc., is Dutch. The region's economic development was originally due to the discovery of coal at the beginning of this century, and many other industries have since grown up in the vicinity of the mines. This attracts migrant workers, mainly from Italy, Spain, Turkey, Greece and Morocco. There are also Poles and Ukranians who came either before the Second World war or immediately afterwards. 92% of these foreign workers

are concentrated in eight towns: Beverloo (1,096), Bilsen (1,321), Genk (20,249), Heusden (2,711), Houthalen (4,800), Koersel (2,077), Maasmechelen (8,385) and Zolder (2,072).

The two investigators first of all examined a number of studies, the most important of which are mentioned in Appendix III. These studies deal with the difficulties encountered by Belgian children and teachers as a result of the massive influx of foreigners into their classes. This was one more reason for adopting a different standpoint, namely that of the difficulties encountered by migrants' children and their teachers of foreign origin.

Segers and Van den Broeck soon found that there were two kinds of bilingual instruction. On the one hand, there are four bilingual day-schools (in the sense defined below) and, on the other, a large number of evening classes for children to whom foreign teachers try to transmit the languages of their particular groups. Of the four bilingual day-schools, one is a nursery school (3 classes), two are primary schools (one with two classes, the other with five), and one is a lower secondary school (the first three years of secondary education). All four are bilingual in that teaching is in Italian, but Dutch is taught from the first year of primary education. There are evening courses for Italian, Turkish, Spanish, Greek, Polish, Ukranian, Arabic and French. I am treating these as belonging to a bilingual programme, however, because they are all designed for foreign children who attend a unilingual Dutch school during the day. The complementary nature (Dutch and mother tongue) of the day-schools and evening courses, which usually use the same premises but at different times, warrants the view that the children attending them have a kind of bilingual programme.

Interviews were conducted with the teachers of the four bilingual day-schools and of each language group which runs evening courses. The questions asked are set out in Appendix II.

There is room here for only the gist of the replies. A much fuller account of the survey may be found in the paper which J. Segers and J. Van den Broeck presented to the 3rd International Congress of Applied Linguistics, held in Copenhagen in August 1972. This paper, entitled "Bilingual education programmes for the children of migrant workers in the Belgian Province of Limburg", will probably be reproduced in the record of the Congress.

First of all, the main features of the day-schools. They are not pluralistic in Kjolseth's sense of the term, as they were established by the Italian Government for the avowed purpose of counteracting the unilingual Dutch education provided at other Limburg day-schools. The Italian schools were set up mainly for two kinds of children: those who had already attended a Belgian school but whose parents intended to return shortly to Italy, and those who had recently arrived from Italy. Their programmes might be termed "reassimilatory" in the case of children about to return to Italy and "anti-assimilatory" in the case of the others. If, however, parents newly arrived from Italy decide after a few months to send their children to a unilingual Belgian school, the programme might become an assimilatory one, in that Italian would have served merely to tide over the period until the pupil was able to follow lessons in Dutch. The Italian day-schools are anti-assimilatory, or were at least intended to be so by the Italian Government. This is clear from the fact that the Italian Government set them up without the Belgian Government being concerned in the scheme, as well as from the fact that neither the Italian migrant community nor the Belgian community were consulted. Moreover, the "Belgian" part of the programme is confined to the teaching of Dutch, there being no other introduction to the life of the host country. The teachers, with a few exceptions, are not bilingual (Italian - Dutch); classes are not open to Belgian children; there is no corresponding programme of adult education; little or no information is provided on bilingual (Italian - Dutch) careers, etc.

The main features of the evening courses are even more questionable in terms of Kjolseth's pluralistic model. The organisers are almost all unilingual foreigners. They, too, have designed their programmes as anti-assimilatory ones. But since the children who attend them come in the evening, tired after a full day in a unilingual Dutch school, their success is limited, to say the least. Among themselves, the children already speak Dutch, which the foreign teachers do not generally understand. The latter are unable to meet their Dutch-speaking colleagues at the day-school for the purpose of co-ordinating their work, and the Belgian teachers do not understand their foreign colleagues' languages. The children are thus torn between two cultural poles. The most damaging feature is that they receive all their day-time education in the language in which they are weakest. MacNamara (see Appendix III) has given a good description of the backwardness and failures attributable to this system, so there is no need to dwell on the subject here.

One point is worth noting, however. A few miles away from the schools just described there is a quadrilingual school, the European School at Mol, where four groups (German, French, Italian and Dutch) receive their primary

education in their mother tongues. The same arrangement applies to the first part of secondary education, but emphasis is placed on German and French as second languages. At the upper secondary level, instruction is partly in German and partly in French, except in the case of the Italian and Dutch-speaking pupils, whose language and literature lessons continue to be in the mother tongue. It is true that this school is attended by the children not of migrant workers (as defined on page 1 of this report) but of European civil servants. Nevertheless, what can be done for the latter could, I feel, also be attempted for the former, i.e. for migrant workers' children.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The gist of any conclusions can be expressed in one sentence: host countries should run bilingual schools (or at least programmes) on the lines of Kjolseth's pluralistic model.

I have, I trust, shown that it is not reasonable to leave migrant workers to their own devices or in the hands of the governments of their countries of origin. Leaving them to their own devices means depriving their children of a sound education, especially if they return to their own countries later.

It also means depriving the host country of a natural reservoir of highly motivated bilinguals, especially if the children stay there. Failure to cultivate the mother tongue is therefore a waste from every point of view. Nor is the answer to leave migrant workers' children entirely in the hands of their countries of origin. As we saw in the case of Limburg, this entails giving free scope to an anti-assimilatory system, which divides a child between two cultural poles.

This does not mean that the host country should not seek the co-operation of the country of origin. But it is even more important, according to Kjolseth's pluralistic model, to obtain the co-operation of the local population - both the local-born community and the migrant one (or, usually, ones).

I readily admit that what I am advocating is a change in customs and in the laws of host countries.

I am advocating a change in the customs of parents and teachers - for it is possible to recognise the merits of a pluralistic bilingual education programme for foreigners without taking the crucial step of acknowledging that such a programme may also be relevant to local-born children. This will be especially difficult because migrant workers often speak dialects and settle in industrial areas where national workers are also more at home in a dialect. As the school tends to be an institution representing the interests and ideologies (or prejudices) of the dominant groups, which are closely linked with the standard language and official culture, a fairly fundamental change of outlook is necessary. But proceeding from the sociological situation as it is, and not as one would like it to be, is still the basic approach of any popular education. Only if this reality is taken into account will it be possible for migrants and their children to be taken a step forward.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

./.

I am also advocating a change in the law. In many countries, subsidised education, whether State-controlled or private, can be given only in the national or regional language. Pluralistic bilingual programmes will require special dispensations until such time as they become a fairly general rule in a united Europe where migration is an increasingly common occurrence.

Louvain, 15 September 1972

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE LINGUISTIC STATUS OF MIGRANT WORKERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

1. Name of your country .....

2. Name and address of your organisation .....

.....

3. What are the languages of the main groups of migrant workers in your country? (Enter approximate numbers in brackets):

Language A: ..... (.....) Language E: ..... (.....)

Language B: ..... (.....) Language F: ..... (.....)

Language C: ..... (.....) Language G: ..... (.....)

Language D: ..... (.....) Language H: ..... (.....)

4. Does (a), (b) or (c) below apply to your country?

(a) The government sees to it that migrant workers are taught the language of the host region .....

(b) One or more government-subsidised private organisations see to it that migrant workers are taught the language of the host region .....

(c) One or more private organisations without government subsidies see to it that migrant workers are taught the language of the host region .....

5. Can the children of migrant workers receive instruction in the language of their country of origin thanks to:

(a) the government of your country? .....

(b) the government of the country of origin? .....

(c) private organisations subsidised by your government? .....

(d) private organisations subsidised by the government of the country of origin? .....

(e) non-subsidised private organisations? .....

./.

6. Are there any primary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin?

(Enter in brackets the approximate number of migrants' children attending such schools.)

Language A: ..... (.....) Language E: ..... (.....)

Language B: ..... (.....) Language F: ..... (.....)

Language C: ..... (.....) Language G: ..... (.....)

Language D: ..... (.....) Language H: ..... (.....)

7. Are there any secondary schools where instruction is mainly in the language of the country of origin?

(Enter in brackets the approximate number of migrants' children attending such schools.)

Language A: ..... (.....) Language E: ..... (.....)

Language B: ..... (.....) Language F: ..... (.....)

Language C: ..... (.....) Language G: ..... (.....)

Language D: ..... (.....) Language H: ..... (.....)

8. Is there a ministerial department, a committee or any other body responsible for the linguistic status of migrant workers and their children? If so, give name(s) and address (es):

.....

If not, can you provide the name and address of any person well informed about the linguistic status of migrant workers and their children?

.....

Please return to Mr. Albert VERDOODT, c/o Mr. Sven Nord, Council of Europe, 67 - STRASBOURG, France.

A P P E N D I X II

QUESTIONNAIRE ON BILINGUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE LIMBURG REGION (BELGIUM)

1.1 When was the school established? .....

1.2 Who pays the teachers and bears the cost of maintaining the premises and equipment? .....

2.1 Who drew up the programme? .....

2.2 Was the local population consulted when the programme was being drawn up? .....

2.3 Is there any consultative committee? .....

2.3.1 If so, who are its members? .....

2.3.2 If not, have you ever altered the programme as a result of:

2.3.2.1 contacts with parents? .....

2.3.2.2 contacts with pupils? .....

2.3.2.3 contacts with migrant workers' "circles of friends"? .....

2.4 Are there any lessons to which parents are invited?

.....

2.5 Could you describe the programme according to the subjects? .....

2.5.1 What subjects are taught? .....

2.5.2 For how many hours? .....

2.5.3 In what language(s)? .....

25.4 What countries' history, folklore and geography are taught? .....

2.6 What text-books are used? .....

2.6.1 Belgian text-books? .....

2.6.2 Or Italian, Turkish, Greek text-books? .....

2.6.3 Or special text-books? .....

2.6.4 What culture are these text-books based on? .....

2.7 What language (s) do you use for:

2.7.1 physical education? .....

2.7.2 artistic classes? .....

2.7.3 music classes? .....

2.8 How many books in the migrants' languages are there in the school library? (as a percentage) .....

2.8.1 What kinds of books? .....

2.8.1.1 Are there any comics? .....

2.8.1.2 Are there any magazines? .....

2.8.1.3 Are there any newspapers? .....

2.8.1.4 Are there any comic strips? .....

2.8.1.5 Are there any books:

(a) on different subjects? .....

(b) suitable for different social classes? .....

(c) suitable for different age groups (see 5.2.3)? .....

2.9 Are there any cultural activities? .....

2.9.1 If so, to what culture do they belong? .....

2.9.2 What kind of dancing are the children taught? .....

2.10 What kinds of out-of-school activities are held?

.....

2.11 What language is used in the playground? .....

3.1 What is the nationality of the teachers? .....

3.1.1 Where were they born? .....

3.1.1.1 Is their ethnic origin:

(a) local? .....

(b) non-local? .....

3.2 What studies have they done? .....

3.2.1 Did they do them in:

(a) Belgium? .....

(b) the migrants' country of origin? .....

3.2.2 What did their studies consist of? .....

3.3 Who teaches what? .....

3.3.1 What qualifications are required in order to teach the various branches of subjects? .....

3.4 Do the teachers live:

3.4.1 among the migrant workers? .....

3.4.2 elsewhere? .....

3.5 Are the teachers active in the ethnic community? ...

3.5.1 If so, what are their activities? .....

3.6.1 Do the children's parents know the teachers? .....

3.6.2 Do the teachers know the children's parents? .....

3.7 As regards the teachers' language:

3.7.1 Does the Dutch teacher have any knowledge of the language, culture, history and geography of the migrants' country of origin? .....

3.7.2 Does the teacher of the migrants' language have any knowledge of Dutch and the culture, history and geography of Belgium? .....

3.7.3 What is the attitude towards the other's language and culture of:

3.7.3.1 the Dutch teacher? .....

3.7.3.2 the teacher of the migrants' language? .....

3.8 What are the Belgian and foreign teachers' attitudes towards the kind of language, i.e. dialect or standard form? .....

3.8.1 (vis-à-vis migrants' children) Does the teacher accept the fact that the children speak various dialects (e.g. Italian or Turkish dialects)? .....

3.8.2 Are there separate classes for the different dialects spoken by the children? .....

3.9 Do the teachers meet regularly to consult each other and plan the Dutch and foreign parts of the programme?

.....

3.9.1 If so, how often? .....

4.1 Are the classes:

4.1.1 mixed (migrant and Belgian (1)) or homogeneous? .....

4.1.2 mixed from the first year? .....

./.

(1) Taking Belgian to mean children whose parents are both Belgian.

5.1 Is there an adult education programme? .....

5.2 How is it run:

5.2.1 parallel to the children's programme? .....

5.2.2 with two teaching languages which are each given the same amount of time and the same treatment?

.....

5.2.3 with emphasis on dialects at the start? .....

5.2.4 with the same teachers as for the children? .....

5.2.5 with the possibility of borrowing books from the school library? .....

6.1 Do parents readily send their children to the bilingual school or programme? .....

6.2 If so, what are their reasons for doing so?

.....

6.3 Do you think such schools foster the children's subsequent careers? .....

6.3.1 If so, what benefits do they derive from them?

.....

6.4 Does the school provide information on job opportunities for bilinguals? .....

6.4.1 If so, at what stage? .....

6.4.2 How often in the course of the school career? .....

6.4.3 In what form? .....

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A P P E N D I X III

Brief bibliography

BATON, Pierre: Co-éducation d'enfants belges et étrangers. Etudes de sociologie de l'éducation, Editions de l'Institut de Sociologie de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, 1968.

DE COSTER, Sylvain, & DERUME, Emile: Retard pédagogique et situation sociale dans la région du Centre et au Borinage, Brussels, Institut de Sociologie, 1962.

GAARDER, A.Bruce: Organisation of the Bilingual School, in The Journal of Social Issues, XXIII (2 April 1967) pp. 110-120.

KJOLSETH, Rolf: Bilingual Education Programmes in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism? Paper presented in the section on "Sociological perspectives on bilingual education" of the Socio-linguistics Programme at the seventh World Congress of Sociology held in Varna, Bulgaria, 14 - 19 September 1970. A revised version is published in KJOLSETH, R. & SACK, F., (hrsgs): Zur Soziologie der Sprache. Ausgewählte Schriften vom VII. Weltkongress der Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 1971; in SPOLSKY, Bernard, (ed.): The Language Education of Minority Children: Selected readings, Rowley, Massachussetts, 1972; and in TURNER, Paul R., (ed.): Bilingualism in the Southwest, Tucson, Arizona, The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

MACNAMARA, John: The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance - A Psychological Overview, in The Journal of Social Issues, XXIII, (2 April 1967), pp. 58-77.

MOULIN, P.: Problèmes d'intégration des jeunes immigrés dans l'enseignement primaire et secondaire, Liège, Province de Liège, s.d. (1971).

VAN DER PLANK, P.H.: Taalassimilatie van Europese taalminderheden. Een inventariserende en hypotesevormende studie naar assimilatieverschijnselen onder Europese taalgroepen. Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van dokter in de sociale wetenschappen aan de Rijksuniversiteit in Utrecht. 1970. Published in Rotterdam, 1971, by Bronder (offset).

VERDOODT, A.: Educational Policies on Languages: The Case of the Children of Migrant Workers in the Light of Two Theories. Paper presented at the 3rd International Congress of Applied Linguistics (Copenhagen), 21 - 26 August 1972.

VOSSEN, M.: Het lager onderwijs als factor van integratie bij de kinderen van gastarbeiders in Belgisch Limburg. Licentiaatsverhandeling. Department of Sociology, KUL, Leuven, 1970. Unpublished.